

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,636	07/11/2001	Thomas Malzahn	MALZ3001 / FJD	7902
23364	7590 03/08/2005		EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE			JACKSON, ANDRE K	
FOURTH FLO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2856	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	09/901,636	MALZAHN, THOMAS				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	André K. Jackson	2856				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	1				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1						
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 J	anuary 2004.					
	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10 and 12</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
_	Claim(s) <u>1-10 and 12</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	ur alaction requirement					
are subject to restriction and/c	n election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		_				
	epted or b) objected to by the					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- , ,	, ,				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
		, , , o, , o , o , o , o , o , o , o ,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority document		ion No				
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
application from the International Burea	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)	A) T lake-it-ii 0	(PTO 412)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locke in view of Bellee et al.

Regarding claim 1, Locke discloses a "Method and apparatus for material level measurement using stepped frequency microwave signals" which has a signal-generating unit (8), an input coupling unit (12), an antenna (11), and a receiving and evaluating unit (4). Locke does not disclose a dielectric layer containing a feed structure and a plurality of cutouts.

However, Bellee et al. disclose a "Dual polarized image antenna" which has a dielectric layer containing a feed structure (25) and a plurality of cutouts (Figures 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Locke to include a dielectric layer containing a feed structure and a plurality of cutouts as taught by Bellee et al. since multiple frequencies can be used with this antenna.

Regarding claim 2, Locke discloses slot shaped recesses that are substantially radial (Figure 4).

Regarding claim 3, Locke discloses where the dielectric layer defines a center with one group of cutouts arranged at approximately a first radius from

Art Unit: 2856

the center of the dielectric layer and at least one further group of cutouts arranged at approximately a second radius from the center of the dielectric layer (Figure 4).

Regarding claim 4, Locke discloses where one group of cutouts are spaced from the cutouts of the first group (Figure 4)

Regarding claim 5, Locke does not disclose the dimensions of the slots. However, it is considered a design choice and clearly within the preview of the skilled artisan to have the slots made a particular size.

Regarding claim 6, Locke does not disclose a dielectric layer connected to at least one dielectric on the side containing the cutouts. However, Bellee et al. do disclose a dielectric layer connected to at least one dielectric on the side containing the cutouts (Figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Locke to include a dielectric layer connected to at least one dielectric on the side containing the cutouts. By adding this feature the effectiveness of the apparatus would be greatly improved.

Regarding claim 7, neither Locke nor Bellee et al. disclose where the cutouts and feed structure are applied to at least one dielectric layer by etching. However, it is clearly within the preview of the skilled artisan to have the cutouts and feed structure applied to at least one dielectric layer by etching since when adding this feature the effectiveness of the apparatus would be greatly improved.

Art Unit: 2856

Regarding claim 8, Locke does not disclose where at least one dielectric layer and dielectric protective layer comprise a circular disk. However, Bellee et al. disclose where at least one dielectric layer and dielectric protective layer comprise a circular disk (Figure 1). Therefore, the skilled artisan would have been inclined to modify Locke to include where at least one dielectric layer and dielectric protective layer comprise a circular disk. By adding this feature the apparatus would be more compact and rugged.

Regarding claim 9, Locke discloses where measuring signals comprise signals in the broadband range (Column 3).

Regarding claim 10, Locke discloses where the antenna and its cutouts cooperate where the antenna emits measuring signals of a selected mode (Column 3).

Regarding claim 12, Locke does not disclose where the dimension and shapes of the cutouts are defined in the planar direction of the first dielectric layer. However, Bellee et al. disclose where the dimension and shapes of the cutouts are defined in the planar direction of the first dielectric layer (Figures 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Locke to include where the dimension and shapes of the cutouts are defined in the planar direction of the first dielectric layer. By adding this feature the effectiveness of the apparatus would be greatly improved.

Art Unit: 2856

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 01/28/04 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Applicant has argued that the written description of the slots

Page 5

in Belle et al. does not indicate that they are different. However, in figure 5

(shown on the next page) it can be seen that slot (40) is deeper and smaller

than slot (45), which is longer and shallower than (40). This constitutes both

a different dimension and a different shape from one another.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to André K. Jackson whose telephone

number is (703) 305-1522. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-

Thurs. 7AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on (703) 305-4705.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.J

March 7, 2005

Mezin E. Welli-HEZRON WILLIAMS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Art Unit: 2856

